



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/579,035	05/26/2000	Sadeg M. Faris	105-081USANDO	8056
26665	7590	11/24/2003	EXAMINER	
REVEO, INC. 85 EXECUTIVE BOULEVARD ELMSFORD, NY 10523			BORISSOV, IGOR N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

3629

DATE MAILED: 11/24/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/579,035

Applicant(s)

FARIS ET AL

Examiner

Igor Borissov

Art Unit

3629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08/28/03.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 374-379 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 374-379 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Objections*

**Claim 374** is objected to because of the following informalities: in the response for the office action of 04/28/03, the applicant specifies that the **claims 1-374** has been canceled. However, new claims begin from the **claim 374**. Appropriate correction is required.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 374 and 379 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murphy (US 6,317,500).**

Murphy teaches a method and system for location-sensitive decryption of an encrypted signal, comprising:

**As per claims 374 and 379,**

embodying a GSU chip into said network computing device (column 6, lines 46-56);

programming the GSU chip in said GSU-enabled network computing device with a set of predetermined time and space (TS) coordinates so as to enable said GSU-enabled network computing device to access a communications network only when said

Art Unit: 3629

GSU enabled network computing device is temporally and spatially present at said TS coordinates (column 6, lines 46-56);

disposing said GSU-enabled network computing device at said predetermined TS coordinates so as to automatically enable said GSU-enabled network computing device to access said communications network (column 6, lines 46-56).

Murphy teaches that said communications network may provide an educational or informational messages, or television signal (column 7, lines 38-52).

However, Murphy does not specifically teach that said communications network includes the Internet.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include that said communications network includes the Internet, because it appears that the claimed features do not distinguish the invention over similar features in the prior art, and the teachings of would perform the invention as claimed by the applicant with either specifically teaching the Internet, or not.

**Claims 375 and 377 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murphy in view of Rangedahl et al. (US 5,790,074).**

**As per claims 375 and 377**, Murphy teaches said GSU-enabled network computing device including a GRS unit so as to enable said GSU-enabled network computing device to access a communications network in the authorized location (column 6, lines 46-56).

However, Murphy does not teach a TS-stamping tracking server for receiving and processing a digitally-signed data indicative that said computing device is present at

Art Unit: 3629

authorized location, and automatically transmitting a digitally-signed package back to said computing device to access said communications network.

Rangedahl et al. teach an automated location verification and authorization method and system, comprising a communication device equipped with a GPS unit, and an authorization device, wherein said authorization device receives encrypted data indicative that said communication device is present at authorized location, and automatically transmits an encrypted data to said communication device to authorize access to a communications network (column 2, lines 4-31).

However, Rangedahl et al. do not specifically teach that said authorization device includes a server.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Murphy to include an authorization device for receiving and processing a digitally-signed data indicative that said computing device is present at authorized location, and automatically transmitting a digitally-signed package back to said computing device to access said communications network, because it would enhance the security of the system by allowing the operation of said computing device in the authorized location only.

Also, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Murphy and Rangedahl et al. to include that said authorization device includes a server, because it appears that the claimed features do not distinguish the invention over similar features in the prior art, and the teachings of

Art Unit: 3629

Murphy and Rangedahl et al. would perform the invention as claimed by the applicant with either specifically teaching said server, or not.

**Claims 376 and 378 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murphy and Rangedahl et al. and further in view of Dowling et al. (US 6,522,875).**

**As per claims 376 and 378**, Murphy and Rangedahl et al. teach said GSU-enabled network computing device including a GRS unit so as to enable said GSU-enabled network computing device to access a communications network in the authorized location (Murphy: column 6, lines 46-56), wherein authorities are notified if unauthorized action is performed with said GSU-enabled network computing device (Murphy: column 6, lines 56-61; column 8, lines 19-28).

**Also, as per claims 376 and 378**, Murphy and Rangedahl et al. teach that said GSU-enabled network computing device is disabled in the unauthorized area (Murphy: column 6, lines 46-56).

However, Murphy and Rangedahl et al. do not specifically teach that said GSU-enabled network computing device is partially enabled while being outside of the authorized location.

Dowling et al. teach a method and system for geographical web browser, comprising a mobile unit equipped with a GPS unit and a browser, and a communication server, wherein said communication server controls flow of information to said mobile unit based on GPS information received, thereby suggesting partial enabling of said mobile unit (column 3, lines 1-3; ocolumn 4, lines 31-42).

Art Unit: 3629

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Murphy and Rangedahl et al. to include that said GSU-enabled network computing device is partially enabled while being outside of the authorized location, because it appears that the claimed features do not distinguish the invention over similar features in the prior art, and the teachings of Murphy and Rangedahl et al. would perform the invention as claimed by the applicant with either specifically teaching that said computing device is partially enabled, or not.

***Remarks***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 374-379 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure (see form PTO-892).

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Igor Borissov at telephone number (703) 305-4649.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 872-9306.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's Supervisor, John Weiss, can be reached at (703) 308- 2702.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

***Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks***

Art Unit: 3629

***Washington D.C. 20231***

or faxed to:

**(703) 872-9306** [Official communications; including After Final  
communications labeled "Box AF"]

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 5, 2451 Crystal  
Drive, Arlington, VA, 7<sup>th</sup> floor receptionist.

**JOHN G. WEISS  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600**